``_	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/628,598	DAGGETT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yewebdar T. Tadesse	1734
All Participants:	Status of Application	·
(1) Yewebdar T. Tadesse.	(3)	V
(2) <u>James V. Lilly</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 9 November 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative) o	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		·
Claims discussed:		
8,12-13, 17, 21, 24 and 25		
Prior art documents discussed: Matsui (US 5,766,671)		
Part II.	•	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief set 	on. The examiner will provide a vocation of the substance of	written summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
·		
		•
Lenh CF		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	pplicant/Applicant's Representativ	re Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It is agreed to replace the limitation of "a pressure communicative conduit" with[a pressure communicative fluid conduit] in independent claims 8, 17 and 24 to clearly distinguish the claimed apparatus over reference US'671 - showing electrical line (wire) communication between the pressure sensor and the coating enclosure (see Fig 5), in comparision to a fluid conduit as claimed in the instant application. Some other claim languages are also amended to avoid 112 2nd paragraph issues (see enclosed Examiner's Amendment)